



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/931,657	08/16/2001	Andrew Charles David Hay	B-4271 618992-5	2844
22879 7590 05/27/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, CAO H				
ART UNIT 2173		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 05/27/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/931,657

Applicant(s)

HAY ET AL.

Examiner

Cao (Kevin) Nguyen

Art Unit

2173

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calamera in view of Saunder et al. (US Patent No. 6,209,099).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Calamera discloses means for presenting to a user the interactions among the plurality of components [..network-oriented component layer contains the underlying technology for creating encapsulated entity components that contain references to network resources located on computer networks; see col. 8, lines 5-35]; means for allowing the user to modify a security setting associated with at least one of the plurality of components [see col. 12, lines 21-51]; however, Calamera fails to explicitly teach security apparatus comprising means for representing to a user plurality of components of a platform.

Saunder teaches security apparatus comprising means for representing to a user plurality of components of a platform [..the user or operator of the system can trust that all of the software and hardware components of the system have been authenticated; see col. 5, lines 53-

67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Calamera and Saunder before him at the time the invention was made, for creating a secure of a network component system of Calamera to include a secure data processing system by a user, as taught by Saunder. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to build a trusted relationship between the computing apparatus and its users, involves platform integrity checking; therefore, it would enable to provide certain types of communication or information to be trusted to differing degrees.

Regarding claim 2, Calamera discloses wherein the security metric is presented to a user as a representational model of software and/or hardware functionality of the computer entity (see col. 11, lines 34-65 and figure 8).

Regarding claim 3, Calamera discloses according to claim 1, further comprising input means for allowing a user to interact with the modifying means to modify the security setting (see col. 9, lines 7-57).

Regarding claim 4, Calamera discloses further comprising means for establishing possible modifications to the security setting based upon the received security metric (see col. 14, lines 10-56).

Regarding claim 5, Calamera discloses, wherein the level of complexity of the presented is selectable by a user metric (see col. 13, lines 23-59).

Regarding claim 7, Calamera discloses wherein representing the plurality of component comprises representing software and/or hardware functionality of the computer platform (see col. 10, lines 15-55).

Regarding claim 8, Calamera discloses further comprising presenting to the user possible modifications to the security setting (see col. 16, lines 1-61).

Regarding claim 9, Calamari discloses further comprising allowing the user to select a level of complexity of representing to the user the plurality of components (see col. 10, lines 15-57).

Claims 10 and 14, differ from claims 1 and 6 in that “computer-readable code, said computer-readable code being configure to represent to a user a plurality of computer components, represent to the user interactions among the plurality of computer components [see col. 4, lines 7-17 and figure 3] as recited in Saunder; and allow the user to modify a security setting associated with at least one of the computer components; (see col. 2, lines 40-62). One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to build a trusted relationship between the computing apparatus and its users, involves platform integrity checking; therefore, it would enable to provide certain types of communication or information to be trusted to differing degrees.

Regarding claims 11 and 15, Calamera discloses wherein representing the plurality of computer components comprises representing software and/or hardware functionality of a computer (see col. 6, lines 18-65).

Regarding claims 12 and 16, Calamara discloses, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured to present the user possible modifications to the security setting (see figures 10-12).

Regarding claims 13 and 17, Calamara discloses, wherein the computer-readable code is further configured to allow the user to select a level of complexity of representing to the user the plurality of computer components (see col. 10, lines 23-57).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 03/06/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The claims have been discussed as above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (see PTO-892).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cao (Kevin) Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-4053. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571)272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2173

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cao (Kevin) Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

05/22/08